

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

In re: BAIR HUGGER FORCED AIR
WARMING DEVICES PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 15-2666 (JNE/DTS)
ORDER

This Document Relates to All Actions

The parties filed a Joint Motion Regarding Continued Sealing. *See* LR 5.6(d)(2).

In an Order filed on June 15, 2023, the Honorable David T. Schultz, United States Magistrate Judge, granted in part and denied in part the motion, and directed the Clerk to keep certain documents sealed and to unseal certain documents. Plaintiffs objected to the Order. Defendants responded. The Court declines to consider Plaintiffs' objection.

“The magistrate judge will ordinarily rule on the joint motion [regarding continued sealing] without oral argument. A party . . . who objects to the order must file a motion for further consideration under LR 5.6(d)(3).” LR 5.6(d)(2)(C). “A party . . . may object to a magistrate judge’s order disposing of a motion for further consideration of sealing, but only if that party . . . filed or opposed the motion. The objection is governed by LR 72.2(a).” LR 5.6(d)(4).

Plaintiffs objected to the June 15 Order. They did not file a motion for further consideration under LR 5.6(d)(3). Accordingly, the Court declines to consider Plaintiffs' objection. *See* LR 5.6(d)(2)(C); LR 5.6 Advisory Committee Note (2017) (“No party . . . may ask the district judge to review the magistrate judge’s order [ruling on the joint motion]. Instead, a party . . . who objects to the order must first file a motion for further

consideration under LR 5.6(d)(3). An order disposing of a motion for further consideration is reviewable by the district judge.”).

Based on the files, records, and proceedings herein, and for the reasons stated above, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Clerk of Court shall terminate Docket No. 2303.

Dated: July 20, 2023

s/Joan N. Ericksen
JOAN N. ERICKSEN
United States District Judge